

Southwest Coordinating Group

February 23, 2004, 1300 to 1530 hours.

Coronado NF Supervisors Office, Tucson, Arizona

Attending: Bill Waterbury, Pam McAlpin, Jeff Whitney, and Dugger Hughes.
Attending by conference phone: Bob Lee, Nancy Neskauskas, Willie Begay

Absent: Kirk Rowdabaugh, Bryan Swift

Three Tier Dispatch Study Proposal (attached)

Discussion – Accepted the proposal as written. Clarification was needed on two points: Due date of June 1 is adjustable as task group is formed and fire season begins; and make up of the task group is to be as interagency as possible, agreed to having a NICC representative, and if possible to have a local fire representative. Dugger Hughes was present and accepted the task.

2005 IMT Meeting Proposal

Discussion – Request from Nancy to consider holding the 2005 SW Area IMT Meeting in New Mexico to allow a tie to the NM Fire Chiefs Association as occurred this year in the Phoenix meeting. Jeff said that the IMT's had locked in a place in Phoenix for next year but would discuss it with Dan for consideration. Tabled for further discussion.

2004 Type 1 Team Rosters

Discussion – Concerns expressed by Zone Chairs at the 60 persons shown on the SW Type 1 Team Rosters, also effect it has on filling Type 2 IMT's, particularly New Mexico. Reconfirmed SWCG position that we expect the teams to meet National Mobilization Guide requirements of 38 plus 6 trainees for primary team number of around 42, SWCG also supports up to 15 trainees on the teams including 520 candidates.

We requested that the rosters reflect “primary” and “additional support” members. We recognize the need to meet the additional management requirements of today's incidents and lack of ability to rapidly fill positions. We will work with Zones to fill needs on Type 2 Teams, Jeff and Dan are sensitive to the issue.

2005 Type 1 Team Monitory Support

Discussion - Dugger wanted to know the status of money committed to the Teams from the Agencies. Each agency will help purchase items as requested through Dugger. Until fund transfer issues are resolved between agencies, this appears to be the only viable solution. We will continue to explore the IMT support funding through the SWCC Business Plan in 2005.

Web Page Software Support

Discussion – Jay Ellington proposed changing present Web Page software to a newer type that allows greater interface with other software and the internet.

Proposal accepted, Dugger will work with Jay to develop technical approval for purchase and use on the Forest Service system at SWCC.

Cramer ICT3 certification Forest Service requirements

Discussion – Forest Service will be certifying all their ICT3's by April 30th. Currently will accept other agency qualified ICT3's on Forest Service fires. In the Southwest will need to certify about 150 regular employees, planning one session in NM and two in AZ.

Fire Planning Analysis (FPA) development of defining fire management unit (FMU) polygons in Southwest Geographic Area.

Discussion – Based upon the Fire Program Analysis briefing held in the SW recently we need to define the basic fire management unit polygons for the Southwest Geographic Area by May 1, 2004. The SWCG agrees that the present dispatch zones are not suitable as FMU's since they were originally build around the existing national forest dispatch system tied to national forest boundaries, not necessarily fire vegetation types or logical fire response areas. Propose sending a letter to the two state coordinating groups to request that they submit to SWCG for approval their proposal of FMU's for the states and where there may be need to deal with across state border FMU's. It may be necessary to go initially with present zones but not our first choice, also Three Tier Study may have Zone adjustments to boundaries. May have other issues with across state border FMU's: CA , UT , NV, OK and TX. Jeff will begin discussion with OK and TX on the issue.

Topical information attached from Interior/BLM on FMU's.

Proposed Arizona Fire Service Mutual Aid Plan review response

Discussion – Jeff Whitney has the lead on this reply and he and Bill will finish this week and send out for final concurrence. SWCG general position is that we do not support as proposed because, in brief, of establishing a dual dispatch system for wildland fires in Arizona.

March 9 Meeting with SWA REC and SWCG

Discussion – Developed our proposed March 9 Agenda Items:

1. Annual Southwest Coordination Group opportunity for Updates, Issue Identification, and Discussion with the Southwest Strategy. Time requested: 60 minutes. To be included:

Seasonal Update of Weather and Staffing

Brief Maxwell Fire Season Outlook

Current Team's staffing in Southwest

2004 Activities of the Southwest Coordination Group

Fire Planning Analysis

Smoke management

Three Tier Dispatching

Joint Powers Agreements with Oklahoma and Texas

- New Mexico Fire Agreement
- Communities at Risk
- Grants and Agreements
- Two State subgroups
- Media Guidelines
- Major Interagency Fire Management Issues in the Southwest
 - Availability of Firefighters
 - Managers unwilling to allow highly trained employees to participate
 - Transfer of funds between Agencies
 - Managers not supportive of interagency fund transfers
 - Use of Computers and electronic media between Agencies
 - Managers not supportive of interagency activities with multiple agencies employees such as SWCC, FUTA, and interagency training
- Training and Leadership Roles
 - Encourage SW REC participation in SW MAC

2. Discussion on Status/Barriers/Opportunities of current assignments from Southwest Strategy.

Issue: Allow for exchange of ideas from the selected 2002 Lessons Learned recommendations remaining to be implemented by Southwest Coordinating Group to either set new direction or continue to pursue.

Time requested: 60 minutes

Reviewed and updated the "Southwest Strategy Team Charter Deliverables"

Table briefing (attached) which will constitute a good deal of the discussion with the SWA REC.

(SW Coordinating Group Logo's cut to save space)

Southwest Coordinating Group

February 19, 2004

2004 Wildland Fire Season Memorandum

Directed to: Dugger Hughes, SWCC Coordinator

From: Chair, Southwest Coordinating Group

Topic/Issue: Three Tier Dispatch/Coordination Study

The Southwest Coordinating Group requests that you lead a working team to study the opportunity for three tier dispatch in the Southwest Geographical Area. The criteria for the study are set forth below.

Background: After South Canyon incident in 1994 the IRMT identified three tier dispatch as a issue of effectiveness of the coordination /dispatch system. As a result a National recommendation was to move t a three tier system. USDI-BLM was directed to move to three tier system as soon as practical. In 2002 Lessons Learned Study of the SW Fire Season for the SWAREC recommended that the Southwest move to three tier for efficiency and safety. The SWAREC assigned the task of review and recommendations for moving the Southwest Geographical area to three tier dispatch. Fall of 2003 a preliminary study group developed some key issues and points to consider for the development of a proposal outline for a future working group to focus upon.

Scope of Study: For this study three tier coordination/dispatch is defined as follows: Three levels of dispatch from the incident to the National Coordination Center; i.e. 1) incident to dispatch center, 2) dispatch center to geographical area coordination center, 3) geographical area coordination center to national coordination center. A dispatch center may have single resource responsibility, may be co-located with one or more agencies, or may be totally interagency integrated. A Fire Planning Unit may have one or may have multiple dispatch centers.

Study Method: Examine the following and make recommendations:

1. Present current situation in Southwest GACC.
 - A. Current workload for dispatch and resource orders at SWGACC
 - B. Current workload for dispatch and resource orders at each zone

1. Current political or administrative boundaries for each zone
 2. Current fire and administrative dispatch levels for each agency in each zone as represented by numbers of fires or resource numbers and volume of dispatch communication traffic
- C. Identify present level of dispatch within each zone by location and area served
2. Propose future three tier system for Southwest
 - A. Identify workload change for GACC and centers
 - B. Proposed logical political or administrative boundaries for coordination/dispatch centers either as or within Fire Management Planning Units
 - C. Estimate of the Agencies involved or not involved for each center's area
 - D. Recommend most logical three tier dispatch system if a perfect world with available technology regardless of budget, FTE, Politics
 - E. Staffing and Budget estimation needed to implement and then operate
3. Based upon number 2. above, what are the present physical, political, FTE, Budget, etc. barriers to implement.
 - A. How to ensure cross dispatch sharing of information between centers on incidents
 - B. Display issues with overlapping coverage in proposal and resolutions
 - C. Give SWCG candid opinion where inefficiencies exist today
 - D. What will be the results of zones versus centers in Fire Planning Units
4. Recommendation from this work group to SWCG/SWA REC as to a practical move to three tier in the Southwest
 - A. Timeline
 - B. Barriers to overcome
 - C. Other issues or considerations to be resolved before proposal could be implemented

It is proposed that this work group complete the task by June 1, 2004 or a date that is agreed upon once the task is initiated.

It is proposed that you may select the task group, it is our recommendation that it includes a dispatcher or zone manager, an FMO, a Agency Administrator, and State or local agency representative.

/s/ William C. Waterbury for
William C. Waterbury, 2004-2005 Chair, Southwest Coordinating Group

cc. NICC, Alice Forbes

Memorandum

To:

From:

Re: Fire Planning Unit Delineation

The Fire Program Analysis (FPA) system is a fire program analysis and budgeting tool designed to be used on an interagency landscape-scale area called a Fire Planning Unit (FPU). These units are the geographic areas defined by the local land managers for fire management analysis. While FPA is congressionally mandated for the five federal wildland fire agencies (USDA Forest Service, BLM, BIA, NPS, FWS), FPUs should also include lands managed by Tribal, state, and local partners to the extent practical. Since FPA will be used to justify and allocate Preparedness budgets for all five wildland agencies, all field units must define FPUs and prepare to begin implementation FPA by October 1, 2004.

Implementing FPA will require significant interagency coordination. The first phase of the project, the FPA-Preparedness Module will be used to formulate the FY 2007 budget. As you know, actions required to formulate the 2007 budget begin in FY 2005, so interagency use of FPA must begin in October 2004.

Because of this tight, congressionally-mandated deadline, it is imperative that bureaus agree on the initial configuration of FPUs by May 2, 2004. In order to be effective, FPU boundaries should be determined by local land managers, and reflect local issues and collaborative arrangements. Agency field offices are required to work with their interagency partners to provide Fire Planning Unit boundaries for implementing the FPA - Preparedness Module. It is understood that some FPU boundaries will change over time as the FPA process matures, however, it is important to complete this first effort to define FPUs this spring so that there will be time to consolidate multi-agency data required to implement FPA on schedule. The interagency FPA Implementation Coordination Group working with the Geographic Area Coordinating Boards will be available to assist field units in deciding how to establish FPU partnerships and gather necessary data.

Last year, information was requested and received regarding units in your state/region currently engaged in interagency partnerships and agreements that could be a foundation for forming interagency FPUs. Work on this effort continued after FPA briefings conducted in the Geographic Areas in early 2004. Information about the FPU development process is available on the website at <http://fpa.nifc.gov>. The attached document provides a detailed description of factors to consider in developing Fire Planning Units. This information can be used to help guide local managers as they as they develop their FPUs in collaboration with their partners.

Additional interagency implementation guidance on activities such as data preparation for input to the FPA system will be provided in the future.

If you have questions or concerns on this matter, please contact your FPA Implementation Coordination Group Representative _____ at _____.

(FPA Logo cut to save space)

DRAFT – 2/11/2004

Fire Planning Unit Development Information

The objective of FPA is to model an efficient, cost-effective organization to implement fire management program objectives articulated in the Fire Management Plan (FMP). The Preparedness Module (FPA-PM) will specifically focus on modeling initial response to wildland fire. This first module will determine fire preparedness organizations to achieve land management objectives for alternative budget levels. At any budget level, it will identify an optimal mix of staff and equipment for multi-agency fire management areas to prepare for wildfire suppression response and wildland fire use, based on local fire occurrence, fuels, burning conditions, and values-to-be-protected.

FPA runs an analysis on an interagency, geographic area called a Fire Planning Unit (FPU). A Fire Planning Unit consists of one or more Fire Management Units. Fire Management Units are aggregated across administrative unit boundaries to form a larger Fire Planning Unit. Fire Planning Units are the geographic scope of the landscape defined for the fire management analysis. Fire Planning Units are scalable, and may be contiguous or non-contiguous. Fire Planning Units relate to any combination of administrative units or sub-units, and are not predefined by Agency administrative unit boundaries.

The purpose of this document is to provide general information about the formation of Fire Planning Units. While there are no hard and fast rules related to developing FPUs, there are landscape-scale attributes and characteristics in addition to management and operational considerations that inform managers in developing FPUs.

Considerations in forming Fire Planning Units include, but are not limited to:

Landscape-scale considerations

- Compatible land management goals and objectives and/or fire management objectives
- Adjacent, intermingled or proximate lands with potential partners
- Similar fuels conditions that require coordinated fuels treatments and/or suppression strategies
- Common watershed or other ecological boundaries
- Common or similar ecosystem management problems affected by wildland fire (e.g critical habitat, cultural resources, fire dependent vegetative communities)

Management Considerations

- Common political and social issues (wildland-urban interface, smoke management, etc.)
- Meets Congressional/OMB intent for interagency fire planning
 - Includes small units with little local fire capability
 - Interagency partnerships, wherever feasible, rather than stand-alone units.
 - Avoid fragmentation and possible duplication of initial response capability
- Good interagency communication among local line officers and their respective fire and resource staffs
- History of working together on land management issues.
- Considers Tribal, state and local cooperative relationships

Operational Considerations

- Existing interagency cooperative agreements/mutual aid zones
- Participation in shared dispatch centers serving a common geographic area
- Common operation centers (Guard Stations, Fire Stations, Field Stations)
- Currently sharing or potential for sharing initial response resources
- Adjacent units with similar or common fuels and/or wildland fire use strategies on either side of an administrative boundary

The following attributes should not be a deterrent to FPU development:

- Age or status of Land/Resource Management Plan (L/RMP)
- Age or status of Fire Management Plan (FMP)
- Lack of current formal agreements
- Lack of occurrence history
- Size of unit/sub-unit (i.e. small units with little or no fire occurrence may still participate in FPU)
- Lack of suppression resources
- Lack of unit GIS information
- Lack of “designated” agency fire planners
- Possible federal partners outside the five wildland fire agencies (DOE, BOR, COE, DOD)
- Geographically isolated from other federal partners (consider adjacent state and local cooperators in your analysis)

Size of an FPU:

There is no one answer for what is an appropriate scale for a Fire Planning Unit. However, there are some implications of small scale versus large scale to consider:

- Are your current resources justified on a single local unit or based on a combined interagency workload?
- What is the feasible span of administrative control - management/support structure required for this new organization?
- Is the group too large to reasonably schedule meetings that all partners could attend?

- What is the overall workload and complexity of that workload – for the current FPA Phase that includes initial response to all types of unplanned ignitions, and also looking ahead to Phase II, which will include all types of fuels treatments (prescribed fire, mechanical, chemical, and biological), and prevention activities.
- There may be system limitations as to workloads that can be analyzed, such as:
 - all of California may have a workload that precludes making the entire state an FPU, but
 - it may be feasible to combine Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island into a FPU.

Subject: Re: FW: Notes from pre and post FMO FPA-briefing meetings

Kirk and I discussed very briefly, how this could potentially effect the configuration of our three-tier system. Might not be a bad idea to talk about it. Sounds like CO is doing something along those lines.

Pamela D. McAlpin

I might suggest this be proposed to the SW REC (SW Strategy) when we meet with them? Just a thought...

Willie N. Begay Jr.

As we were discussing at the workshop - looks like other GACGs are thinking about defining the interagency fire planning units at the geographic area level - something for us to consider a bit more - Kirk

Fire Committee,

I thought you might be interested in some of the feedback the Fire Program Analysis (FPA) team received during their round of briefings at each of the Geographic Areas. Below is information related to the Southern, Northern Rockies, and the Rocky Mountain Geographic Areas.

Don Artley

I thought you might be interested to scan the following. It will give you a feel of what the field is doing as a result of the recent and ongoing whirlwind one day FPA presentations at each geographic area.

Gardner Ferry

Here's some feedback (see below) on what the Rocky Mt. Geographic area Did to start delineating their FPU's after the geographic area briefing by the FPA core team. The Northern Rockies took a similar approach.

Here's what Dennis Milburn said about the Northern Rockies approach: "I imagine you have had some sort of report on the FPA briefing/workshop we had in the Northern Rockies last week. It really turned out well from my standpoint. We had all agencies represented and most units within each agency as well. We were able to create some pretty solid FPUs for the entire geographic area. There will probably be some minor tweeking but most look pretty reasonable to me. We've identified a lead agency and/or person to head up the work for each FPU and have identified each partner. It was a good start, now we just to find some time to actually go to work. I was really surprised, and pleased, that the Northern Rockies Coordinating Group decided to provide the umbrella support and management of the entire FPA process for the area. That will really provide some good consistent oversight of the process, and they have been delegated some decision-making authority from all of the agencies. This will help ensure each FPA keeps its interagency focus."

The Southeast Region also made their first attempt at delineating FPU's after their geographic area briefing last week. They made good progress and still have some more work to do. They are looking at forming up an interagency task group to lead the process.

Anyway, I wanted to share some success stories with you all - hopefully some of their approaches can help you all out as well. I especially

like the concept of forming a geographic area implementation team/task group to begin the FPA process.

Please distribute as needed.

We had a good discussion on possible FPU configurations, discussing the pro's and cons. I think that we realized that one size does not fit all, for good reasons. Colorado is approaching the FPU development along the lines of Dispatch Zones. We used the following assumptions to guide our discussions.

- . FPU's are not set in concrete
- . FPU's do not have to have just one FMP associated with it.
- . Not all agencies within the FPU will have all the needed work done.
- . Although initially FPA will not take in account State and private lands and resources, we should build our FPU's to include them.
- . No matter how the lines are drawn, someone will be cut in half.

The discussion of FMU's generated more questions than answers, which was good so that we can follow up to get those answers.

The group supported the concept of a RMACC FPA Implementation Team, who would be points of contact for the individual agencies and provide regional guidance and support to the field.

We developed some self-imposed deadlines for implementation.

FPU boundaries identified: March 1

FMU delineated by: July 1

FMP in template form by: Sept. 30

The FPA Implementation Team will regroup no later than March 31.

When states and agencies develop their FPU's the focal point to Coordinate and to send the information to.

**Southwest Strategy
Southwest Coordination Group (SWCG)
Ecosystem Health/Fire Team Report
for REC Update
February 23, 2003**

Work Group Sponsors: Harv Forsgren

Work Group Contact: Bill Waterbury, USFS SWCG Chair
Denise McCaig, USFS Agency

Administrator

Issues/Comments

Discussion Items: Annual SWS REC & SWCG discussion of program updates, issue identification, training, identified fire resource needs, fire management leadership roles and responsibilities (Charter item 4a)

Future Meetings:

Budget/Projects

Project 1: Through their website, SWCG should also share future meeting agenda items and meeting notes with the field. (Lessons Learned #12.) Charter Item EH/FTT (4o)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated:\$0

Status: Completed

Project 2: The SWS REC/SWCG should hold an annual meeting for program updates, issue identification and training. (Lessons Learned recommendation #4) Charter item EH/FTT (4a)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated:\$0

Status: March 9 Meeting set for 2004.

Project 3: Zone agency administrators should hold annual meetings to discuss and train in the use of Wildland Fire Situation Analysis documents, local rules of engagement and delegations of authorities. (Lessons Learned recommendation #5) Charter Item EH/FTT (4g)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated:\$0

Status: SWCG is still waiting to see what the new national direction for WFSA is, but has agreed to encouraging local interagency training and discussion by Agency Administrators. The current Chair, Bill Waterbury, is a member of the National Task Group working on this issue and will apply results in Southwest training as available.

Project 4: A field-level agency administrator will be an active member of each SWCG Committee. SWCG will receive from the SW REC the identified agency administrator for each committee on March 1st of each year. (Lessons Learned recommendation #5) Charter item EH/FTT (4e-1)

Proposed Date: March 1, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated: \$0

Status: The list of SWCG Committees and Chairs (or all committee members if available) has been posted to the SWCG web site.

Project 5: Encourage consistent participation of Agency Administrators with Zone Fire Boards and Zone MAC Groups. (Lessons Learned recommendation #5) Charter Item EH/FTT (4f)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated: \$0

Status: The MAC Coordinator ensures that Zone Board Agency Administrators are included on all mailings to keep them informed for fulfilling their responsibilities. In early Spring 2004 the SWCG Chair will send out a reminder letter to Agency Administrators of their duties and responsibilities. SWCG will address this issue during the annual review and update of the MAC Group Handbook and Mobilization Guide (March, Prescott).

Project 6: The southwest wildland fire agency executives require attendance to the national Fire Management Leadership Course by field level Agency Administrators and the geographic Fire Management Leadership Course by sub-unit Agency. Attendance will include a 3-5 year interval. (Lessons Learned recommendation #5) Charter item EH/FTT (4b)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated: \$0

Status: SWCG drafted a proposed policy and was presented to SWSCO on September 9, 2003 by Kurt Rowdaubaugh.

Project 7: Before the 2004 fire season, develop a formal process for the mentoring and shadowing of Agency Administrators in their role with large fire management. (Lessons Learned recommendation #5) Charter item EH/FTT (4c)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated:\$0

Status: Draft Mentoring Shadowing Policy is attached for SWS REC review and approval.

Project 8: Improve interagency coordination on SWCG budget execution. (Lessons Learned recommendation #12 as amended) Charter item EH/FTT (4k)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated:\$0

Status: SWCG is currently exploring a single master agreement among the federal partner agencies for all SWCC and FUTA operating costs. A format has been developed for displaying costs and expenditures by agency for both entities.

Project 9: SWCG will evaluate the zone management of Type 2 Incident Management Teams to identify efficiencies that could be gained by geographic control at preset preparedness levels. (Lessons Learned recommendation #12) Charter item EH/FTT (4m)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated:\$0

Status: SWCG has revised the Mobilization Guide for 2004 to indicate that when in Planning Level IV and V, the Southwest Area Type-2 Incident Management Teams will be mobilized by the MAC Group.

Project 10: SWCG should plan a facilitated team enhancement /improvement session this winter to increase team process effectiveness. (Lessons Learned recommendation #12) Charter item EH/FTT (4n)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated:\$0

Status: Scheduling and financing a facilitated workshop has become a low priority to the group. Earlier attempts either were thwarted by schedule conflicts with the training provider or group members unable to provide funds for the training from their agencies. We will continue to explore opportunities Summer of 2004.

Project 11: The SWCG will develop an interagency, geographic availability process based on preparedness level and unavailability reporting. A REC coordination call will be held when requested by the Southwest Area MAC team. (Lessons Learned recommendation #7, as modified) Charter item EH/FTT (4h)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated:\$0

Status: SWCG will address this issue during the annual review and update of the MAC Group Handbook and Mobilization Guide (March, Prescott).

Project 12: Geographic areas will have only two full-time levels of coordination and dispatching. (Lessons Learned recommendation #11) Charter item EH/FTT (4j)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated:\$0

Status: The SWCG has chartered the Three Tier Working Team to prepare a report for consideration of implementation opportunities. The SWCG had solicited thoughts and ideas from a SWCG Committee then from that discussion prepared a charter for a working Team. The three Tier proposal to date has created a lot discussion at the local dispatch level of practicality of moving to two levels within the geographical area.

Project 13: SWCG will coordinate interagency severity requests. A one-request procedure will be developed for the future. (Lessons Learned recommendation #12 amended) Charter item EH/FTT (4l)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0 Amount Spent/Obligated:\$0

Status: SWCG will update the Operations Handbook this winter (March, Prescott) to direct all participating agencies to post their Severity Plans on the secure portion of the SWCC website for

review by all other agencies. The next step is development of a common format Summer of 2004.

Project 14: Federal and state agencies and local organizations will be asked to participate by supplying identified needs as requested. Increase the available resources for fire suppression. The SW REC will annually in March, provide a list of available resources to the SWCG. (Lessons Learned recommendation #7) Charter Item EH/FTT (4i-1)

Proposed Date: March 9-10, 2004

Budget: \$0

Amount Spent/Obligated:\$0

Status: SWCG will address this issue during the annual review and update of the MAC Group Handbook and Mobilization Guide (March, Prescott).

NWCG Incident Business Working Team is also addressing this issue at the National Level with Homeland Security. The present laws and regulations make it difficult to authorize funds to move between agencies for wildland fire fighting or other emergencies.